



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Greek Inscriptions from Sardes 1. By W. H. BUCKLER and D. M. ROBINSON. Reprinted from the *American Journal of Archaeology*, 2d series. Archaeological Institute of America, Vol. XVI (1912), No. 1.

This inscription, which was discovered in February, 1911, belongs to the end of the fourth century B.C. The text is beautifully engraved in two columns. A small portion at the top of each column is illegible. The document is a mortgage or rather a conveyance with right of redemption reserved. Mnesimachus, an officer in the service of Antigonos the king, had borrowed a sum of money from the temple wardens of Artemis in Sardes. When the debt fell due he was unable to repay it, and executed this mortgage to secure the principal and interest. The document begins with a recital of the terms of the loan and the mortgagor's title to the estate which consists of certain villages and allotments, a few smaller parcels of land, and a farmstead. The mortgagor covenants to undertake any legal processes necessary to defend the title and guarantees quiet possession. The income derived from the estate, less the taxes and expenditures for improvements, is to cover the interest. If the income is impaired by failure of crops the mortgagor binds himself to make good the deficiency. In case the king who really owns the fee simple deprives Mnesimachus of the estate a sum equivalent to twice the original debt by way of penalty becomes at once due and payable. The mortgagee has the right to levy on the property of the mortgagor without legal proceedings. On the expiration of the stipulated term the conveyance becomes absolute. Such are the leading features of this interesting and important document—the only extant example of this type of mortgage.

In 80 pages of commentary the editors have discussed every point of interest with a fulness that leaves nothing to be desired. Illustrative material is drawn from literature, inscriptions, and papyri with exhaustive references to modern literature. The editors are to be congratulated on their good fortune in discovering the inscription and their success in elucidating it.

ROBERT J. BONNER

Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de Caesaribus: praecedunt Origo Gentis Romanae et Liber de Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae, subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus. Recensuit FRANCISCUS PICHLMAYR. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. xxii+210.

The appearance of Dr. Pichlmayr's edition of the *Historia Tripartita* and the *Epitome* ascribed to Aurelius Victor is noteworthy, for this is the first complete text of this corpus that has appeared since the publication of

Schroeter's text some eighty years ago. The qualifications of the editor to deal with the text were established by his previous edition of the *de Caesaribus* (Munich, 1892). This edition was important as the first one in which the reading of the Codex Oxoniensis (O) were combined with those of the Codex Pulmannianus (Bruxellensis) (P), on which previous texts had been based. In constituting the text of the *de Caesaribus* and the *Origo Gentis Romanae* on the basis of these two closely interrelated MSS the editor has used the eclectic method, selecting in each instance what seemed to him to be the better reading. For the *de Caesaribus* this is generally found to be the reading of O, for the *Origo* that of P. His attitude toward the manuscript tradition is characterized by wise conservatism, but in many instances obvious emendations have been made, and well-established corrections and conjectures of earlier editors have been accepted.

The present text of the *de Caesaribus* is essentially the same as that of the edition of 1892. However, a number of changes have been made, some of them in response to the suggestions of Opitz (*Woch. f. kl. Phil.* X [1893], 713-15, and *N. phil. Rundsch.* [1893], 227-29). Thus in 3. 16 instead of Schott's emendation *Ti. Claudium*, the reading of the MSS *Titum Claudium* has been retained, in accordance with the principle elsewhere observed (12. 1; 20. 14; 26. 2 and 7) that errors in names are due, not to the copyists, but to the author himself. Several of the other suggestions of Opitz have been adopted, as the MSS reading *civi* (1892, *cive*) in 13. 11, Pantinus' conjecture *exsector marium* (1892, *exactor parium*, MSS) in 5. 7, and Schott's emendation *ut in Campania sedens* (1892, *uti Campaniam secedens*, Arntzen) in 16. 2. Other changes are the wise retention of the MSS *monendoque* in 9. 4, the retraction of his earlier conjecture *capillatistique* for the corrupt *satisque* and of the bold proposal to read *Sarmatistique* for the impossible *Sardonios* in 13. 3, and the excellent emendation of *imperium* to *imperio* in 39. 12. Less happy is the emendation *atque Aurelio* for *athelio* (O) in 15. 1, where the MSS reading might well have been retained as *at Aelio*, since Pius was regularly known after his adoption as T. Aelius Caesar Antoninus. In the direction of conservatism, the editor has gone too far in rejecting such emendations as Schott's *hortatum* in 8. 2, *biennium* in 10. 5, and *quisque* in 17. 7, and perhaps in the designation as *loci desperati* of certain passages where the text might be easily emended, as in 16. 10, where by means of simple corrections P can be made to read intelligibly: *ita incerta belli eius salut<i> <a> doctrinae studi<os>is metuebantur*.

The text of the *Origo* represents a sane reaction against the radical measures adopted by such editors as Sepp and Smit, whose needless emendations have been wisely relegated to the critical apparatus. The editor has, however, adopted a number of well-established corrections, such as *naviam* for the MSS *naviandi* in 3. 5, and in the much-discussed passage in 3. 4 the reading of the second hand of P *is tum* (i.e., Saturnus) instead of the vulgate *istum* (i.e., Janus) (so also W. T. Semple "Authenticity and Sources of the Or. G. R.")

Studies of the Univ. of Cincinnati II, vi, 3). Also in 4. 4 the irrelevant clause *sed urbem Saturnus cum in Italiam venisset condidisse traditur* is, with Gruner and later editors, rejected, and in 10. 1 the words *qui etiam nunc Euxinius sinus dicitur* are rightly with Sepp regarded as a gloss. However, in some instances the editor has perhaps been over-conservative. Thus he has left the corrupt passage in 11. 3 as a *locus desperatus*, in spite of the easy and convincing emendation of Sylburg, and Jordan's almost certain conjecture of *Acilius Piso* in 10. 2 into *Acilius* <et> *Piso* has not been accepted. Similarly, in 20. 3 he has retained without question the meaningless clause *quae repente exierat*, which in spite of many attempts has never been successfully emended, and which is probably to be regarded as a gloss on the preceding *excitum*.

In the case of the *de Viris Illustribus*, the editor's task is rendered more difficult by the multiplicity of the manuscripts. Of these no less than 63 have been catalogued, and 43 used more or less by Dr. Pichlmayr. The group composed of O and P (group A) is distinguished from the others as containing chaps. 78-86 and lacking chaps. 1 and 16. The other manuscripts (B) fall into two groups, those ending at 77. 9 (C), and the inferior codices which include the whole of chap. 77 (D). This classification was the basis of Wijga's text (Groningen, 1890), and Dr. Pichlmayr's single divergence from it is his addition of Cod. Ricardianus 537 (F) to the C group. Both editors regard A as the best group; and both are inconsistent in giving the preference to C-D in many instances where A contains a reading at least equally intelligible. In this tendency the present editor outdoes his predecessor. Thus in 18. 6 he adopts the common reading *nobilitatis superbiam* (D) instead of *nobilitatem* (A); in 23. 5 he reads *Roma* with B for *a Romanis* with A; in 30. 3 he reads *cum insidias statuisset* for *in insidias venisset*, the reading of A as given by Wijga, and in 63. 1 he omits *dictus* (A), the presence of which alone makes the following clause intelligible. Moreover, like Wijga, the present editor seems to have gone too far in rejecting clauses and sentences occurring only in A. Some of these are evident interpolations, as in 7. 8; 35. 12-16; 51. 5; and 64. 9; but there seems to be no very valid reason for rejecting the mention of Servius Tullius' institution of the census in 7. 8, or for reading in 38. 1 *hostium naves* [triginta] *apprehendit* [tredecim mersit]. On the other hand, preference is sometimes rightly given to the readings of C and D, as *reliquiis* in 23. 9, *Gauri* in 26. 1, and in the clause *quem victum flevit et assidere sibi iussit* in 56. 3, where *quem* and *et* are omitted by A. The editor has shown his usual conservatism in dealing with the manuscript tradition, accepting the best emendations of his predecessors, but rejecting many useless conjectures, like Wijga's IC in 3. 2, and Schott's interpolation in 57. 2. On the other hand, such excellent corrections of Wijga as *iter*<ar>*etur* in 2. 3, and <plebeius> in 20. 2 should have been retained. And the evident glosses *id est Ponto* in 74. 5, and *Ambraciae* in 79. 3 were better omitted. Nor has the editor attempted to emend evidently

corrupt passages as 51. 4 and 71. 2, and the much-discussed clause *ludos in circo* in 8. 3, which is so evidently an erroneous gloss on the preceding *ferias Latinas*, as is shown by the senseless reading of C, *Latinis in circo*.

The text of the *Epitome* is based on the two Codices Gudiani (A), and in so far corresponds with previous editions. Dr. Pichlmayr, however, has added to these MSS the readings of the Codex Mediceus 66, 39 which he has himself collated, and he has established its superiority, as well as that of the closely related Codex Bernensis 104 (group B) over the MSS used as secondary sources by earlier editors. In a few cases the reading of B has even been given the preference, as *patratīs* in 10. 1 and *Leptim* in 20. 8, and especially to fill the lacuna in 34. 1. Also the combined readings of B and C have occasionally been preferred to A, but in the main A has been followed with consistency.

In general, Dr. Pichlmayr's recension is characterized by wisdom and sanity, rather than by any brilliant originality. His object has been, not to utilize an opportunity of displaying his ingenuity, but to present an accurate and usable text, and fulfilling, as it does, such a purpose, this edition deserves a hearty welcome.

DAVID MAGIE, JR.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Lexicon Plautinum, Conscriptit GONZALEZ LODGE. Leipzig: Teubner, Vol. I, fasc. 6 (Ego-Fabula), 1911. Pp. 481-576. Each fasc., M. 7.20.

With this number the sixth of the sixteen fascicles which this lexicon is to comprise makes its appearance. In a review of the first five fascicles for Vol. IV of this journal (pp. 91-93) a statement of the plan of the work and a discussion of its characteristic features were given. In that notice attention was called to the generosity which the editor had shown in publishing all the material which might be helpful in a study of Plautine word-order, forms, and meanings, and further proof of this purpose is furnished in this part of the lexicon, as may be seen by glancing at the heading "forma" under *em* and *eo*, or at the articles on *eo*, *et*, and *ex*, which run respectively to 16, 40, and 14 columns. Articles of special interest to the student of Plautus are those on *ehem*, *ehēu*, *em*, *enim*, and *equidem*, and particularly the treatment of *enim* whose Plautine meaning and position in a sentence seem to have been fixed once for all. The difficulty involved in tracing a connection between the different meanings of *etiam*, of *expedio*, and of certain other words will also arouse his attention. The articles on *et* and *etiam* are contributed by Professor Knapp, that on *ex* by Professor Waters.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY